

DATA USEABILITY WORKSHEET

The Dean Company

Medium: Soil

| Activity | Comment |
|---|---|
| Field Sampling | |
| Discuss sampling problems and field conditions that affect data useability. | There were no apparent problems that could affect data useability. |
| Are samples representative of receptor exposure for this medium (e.g. sample depth, grab vs composite, filtered vs unfiltered, low flow, etc.)? | Yes. Soil samples are representative of receptor exposure for this medium. |
| Assess the effect of field QC results on data useability. | Overall, the trip, field, and rinsate blanks were generally non-detect for VOCs and SVOCs with the exception of low levels of commonly reported laboratory contaminants. Several of the metals in the samples were qualified "B" due to the presence of the metals in blank samples. |
| Summarize the effect of field sampling issues on the risk assessment, if applicable. | There are no field sampling issues that should affect the risk assessment. |
| Analytical Techniques | |
| Were the analytical methods appropriate for quantitative risk assessment? | Yes. Samples were analyzed for organic compounds according to Contract Laboratory Program (CLP) Statement of Work (SOW) for Organic Analysis, Multi-Media, Multi-Concentration, OLM04.2. Inorganic soil samples were analyzed according to CLP SOW for Inorganic Analysis, Multi-Media, Multi-Concentration, ILM04.1. |
| Were detection limits adequate? | Yes. The method detection and quantitation limit were less than the associated risk-based concentration (RBC) values. |
| Summarize the effect of analytical technique issues on the risk assessment, if applicable. | There are no analytical technique issues that should affect the risk assessment. |

DATA USEABILITY WORKSHEET (cont.)

The Dean Company

Medium: Soil

| Activity | Comment |
|--|--|
| Data Quality Objectives | |
| Precision - How were duplicates handled? | Relative percent differences (RPDs) were calculated for one pair of duplicate samples. The RPDs were less than the EPA-approved RPD of 35%. The highest concentration of a compound detected in the samples was used in the risk assessment. |
| Accuracy - How were split samples handled? | Split samples were not collected. |
| Representativeness - Indicate any problems associated with data representativeness (e.g., trip blank or rinsate blank contamination, chain of custody problems, etc.). | Analytes qualified with a "B" due to blank contamination will be considered as non-detects during the risk assessment. |
| Completeness - Indicate any problems associated with data completeness (e.g., incorrect sample analysis, incomplete sample records, problems with field procedures, etc.). | No problems were associated with data completeness. |
| Comparability - Indicate any problems associated with data comparability. | No problems have been associated with data comparability. |
| Were the DQOs specified in the QAPP satisfied? | Yes, the DQOs identified in the Sampling and Analysis Plan were satisfied. |
| Summarize the effect of DQO issues on the risk assessment, if applicable. | There are no DQO issues that should affect the risk assessment. |

DATA USEABILITY WORKSHEET (cont.)

The Dean Company

Medium: Soil

| Activity | Comment |
|---|---|
| Data Validation and Interpretation | |
| What are the data validation requirements? | For organic samples, validators were required to check the following items: holding times, instrument performance checks, initial and continuing calibrations, blanks, system monitoring compounds, matrix spike/matrix spike duplicates, regional QA/QC, internal standards, target compound identification, contract required quantitation limits, tentatively identified compounds, system performance, and overall assessment of data. For inorganic samples, validators were required to check holding times, calibration, blanks, interference checks, laboratory control samples, duplicate samples, matrix spike samples, furnace atomic absorption QC, ICP serial dilution, sample result verification, field duplicates, and perform an overall assessment of the data. |
| What method or guidance was used to validate the data? | Region III modifications to "Laboratory Data Validation Functional Guidelines for Validating Organic (and Inorganic) Analyses", USEPA 9/94 (and 4/93). |
| Was the data validation method consistent with guidance? Discuss any discrepancies. | Yes. The data validation method was consistent with regional guidance. |
| Were all data qualifiers defined? Discuss those which were not. | Yes. All data qualifiers were defined. |
| Which qualifiers represent useable data? | B, J, K, L, U, UJ, and UL |
| Which qualifiers represent unuseable data? | R |
| How are tentatively identified compounds handled? | Only TICs that were determined not to be laboratory or field artifacts were reported. All TICs were reported with an "N" and/or a "J" qualifier. "N" qualified data indicates that the analyte is tentatively identified. "J" qualified data indicates that the analyte is present but the reported value is estimated. TICs will be evaluated qualitatively in the risk assessment. |

DATA USEABILITY WORKSHEET (cont.)

The Dean Company

Medium: Soil

| Activity | Comment |
|--|---|
| Summarize the effect of data validation and interpretation issues on the risk assessment, if applicable. | Unusable data qualified with an “R” will not be used in the risk assessment. All other data, both qualified and unqualified, will be used in the risk assessment. |
| Additional notes: | None. |